Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/782,683	RUSSELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BERNARD KRASNIC	2624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Bernard Krasnic (Examiner).	(3)	
(2) Mr. Derek Benke (Reg. No. 56,944).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 February 2009	Time: <u>11:30am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
, ,,		
Claims discussed: Claim 9		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:		
See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Bernard Krasnic/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624	r	
(A ₁	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/782,683

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated a call to the Applicant's attorney, Mr. Benke, in order to offer an Examiners Amendment to expedite prosecution. The Examiner suggested including a "tied to" apparatus limitation in the body of the method claim 9 in order to satisfy the 35 U.S.C. 101 issue [In re Bilski decision] where a method claim needs to be "tied to" an apparatus. Mr. Benke after contacting his Applicant emailed a proposal to the Examiner which is attached to this interview summary. The Examiner agreed to these amendments.